

Date: Sat, 13 Feb 93 04:30:20 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #37  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sat, 13 Feb 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    37

Today's Topics:

                    Abandonment of CW  
            How can a WA4xxx call belong to a novice?  
                    The no-code issue  
            Vero Beach Stop Transmitting Order

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 12 Feb 93 19:31:57 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!caen!rphroy!link.ph.gmr.com!vbreault@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Abandonment of CW  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Feb12.143336.145474@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

    In article <VBREULT.93Feb9171105@rinhp750.gmr.com> vbreault@rinhp750.gmr.com (Val Breault) writes:

        >In article <1993Feb09.154100.139420@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

<stuff deleted here-n-there without further notice>

    I would assert that passing the tests makes one technically qualified.  
    It is self-defining... I think what you mean is that the higher levels  
    of license should require greater technical knowledge, right?

Right Dana. But even more than that, I believe that the current

technical exam for General and especially for Extra is much too easy. Of course, having already gone through them, I suppose I can be said that "Val won't have to re-test and has nothing to lose by raising the requirements". If anyone has an archive of this newsgroup they can go back about a year (before I passed the exam for Extra) and see that I've been saying the same thing all along.

ANECDOTE: (A euphemism for "trite and vapid")

I had been preparing for the Technician exam and was feeling pretty confident about it. About 2 or 3 days before the exam I picked up a study guide for the General exam. I thumbed through it twice... No more than 20 or 30 minutes - tops. After passing the Novice and Technician exams, on a lark, I gave the General exam a try.... YEP, Passed the bugger with less than an hour of study. Am I boasting? NOPE! I'm not as bright as most of the folks that regularly correspond in this newsgroup. If I could claim any credit it would be for the ability to spot the distractors in the multiple choice exam and, thereby, tilt the odds in my favor. If the test had been properly challenging I would have gone down in smoke.

> >The high speed code requirement isn't going to go away any time soon.  
>  
>I have seen NO formal mention from the FCC the ARRL or any other body  
>that proposes to remove the high speed Morse code requirement.

Of course, the stage has been set by the revision of the Technician license. Certainly, one point does not a trend make. However, the FCC has appeared to become favorable to the notion of replacing the CW requirement; in the case of the Technician license, the FCC replaced the CW requirement with lost privileges.

Agreed. I believe it's possible that "some day" we may see a relaxation or elimination of the high speed Morse code requirement. Perhaps even "some day in the near future".... but still "no time soon". I still encourage folks to "just do it". Get it behind you and start having fun again.

> > I believe that anyone that is waiting for  
> >the requirements to change before proceeding with an upgrade is  
> >either wasting time, rattling sabers or isn't really all that  
> >interested in upgrading.  
>  
> Possibly the upgraded privileges aren't worth the effort involved  
> for some people?  
>  
>Why do you think they could not be grouped in that third class?  
>("[not] all that interested in upgrading")

I personally think incentive licensing has been proven to be flawed. The incentive is there for the minority to upgrade. The majority probably do not care.

I take that to mean that we agree "the majority ... do not care" vis-a-vis "not ... interested".

you raised a number of points that just screamed for a response, particularly since they are favorites of the "Pro-Code" crowd :-).

Well Dana, I actually am "Pro-Code". I use it all the time and really enjoy it. I get dressed to it in the morning. I work it late at night while my wife sleeps a few feet away. It's a great mode for >ME<. However, I realize that, like manual transmissions in automobiles, it's not right for >EVERYONE<. I would really REALLY like to see a system that would allow a candidate to choose a mode to use for demonstration of competence.

>P.S. Dana, if you happen to see Rich N6LRT (used to work there) >tell him that Val from SHARE says "HI".

Rich? N-6-Lacy-Red-Teddy? Yup. I see him once and again in the elevator here; he's working for another of the tenants in the building...

"Lacy-Red-Teddy"???? Yep, sounds like Rich all right.

--

-val-

Val Breault - GM Research - vbreault@gmr.com - N80EF  
Instrumentation dept., 30500 Mound Rd., Warren, MI 48090-9055  
The opinions expressed by the author do not necessarily reflect those of GMR or those of the General Motors Corporation.

\\ /|  
\\ / |  
\\ /\_\_|  
\\ / |\_\_

-----

Date: 11 Feb 93 21:19:21 GMT  
From: hayes!bcoleman@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: How can a WA4xxx call belong to a novice?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C1vJv5.Arp@unccsun.uncc.edu>, jmcoving@unccsun.uncc.edu (John Covington WN4BBJ) writes:

>

> As some posters have mentioned, after about 1975 the FCC stopped issuing  
> WN calls to Novices and just issued standard calls.

Actually, it was in 1976.

I was first licensed as WN8WOY in November of 1975. I didn't actually get on the air until June of 1976. After about two months of operating, my license was re-issued as WB8WOY. I held that call until my Novice expired in November of 1977.

I believe the FCC dropped the distinctive callsigns for novice at the same time they raised the power limit from 75 watts input to 200 watts PEP. I distinctly remember what a joy it was to put one of the finals back into my SB-401 so I could run more than 75 watts.

> In late 1977 and early 1978, the FCC allowed you to request any previously  
> held callsign as long as it was not held by someone else within the last  
> year (renewal grace period).

I think this program was limited to Extra class operators, no?

--  
Bill Coleman, AA4LR                               ! CIS: 76067,2327     AppleLink: D1958  
Principal Software Engineer               ! Packet Radio: AA4LR @ W4QO  
Hayes Microcomputer Products, Inc. ! UUCP: uunet!hayes!bcoleman  
POB 105203 Atlanta, GA 30348 USA   ! Internet: bcoleman%hayes@uunet.uu.net  
Disclaimer: "My employer doesn't pay me to have opinions."  
Quote: "The same light shines on vineyards that makes deserts." -Steve Hackett.

-----  
Date: 11 Feb 93 14:03:10 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!linac!att!mcdchg!chinet!megabyte@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: The no-code issue  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:  
>not prohibited from using CW in the bands above 30MHz, the no-code  
>has full operating priviledges above 30MHz including the 50.0 to  
>50.1 and 144.0 to 144.1 CW only segments of the 6m and 2m bands.

Key point here.... "No-code" techs can operate CW. They have full rights above 50 Mhz. So, we already have CW bands open to people whohave not passed a code test... thought if they want to operate on those bands they had better learn some code.

Too bad the same thinking can't be applied to the HF bands.

--  
"It is a pity that even a single drop of this noble  
gift of God should be spilled" - J.S. Bach on wine

Mark E. Sunderlin: Technocrat in Winchester, Virginia KD4HRI  
aka Dr. Megabyte: megabyte@chinet.chi.il.us (703) 722-9330

-----  
Date: 12 Feb 93 15:55:43 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Vero Beach Stop Transmitting Order  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Information from Milt Farber, WB4IFM. (MF@dllws.cca.cr.rockwell.com)

February 11, 1993

David K. and Sharon T. Brower, WA4NST and N4XLF respectively, of Vero Beach, Florida, recently lost a two year legal battle over their 68 foot radio tower and antennas. In the Final Judgment for the plaintiffs (seven households), Judge Charles E. Smith of the 19th Judicial Circuit in and for Indian River County, Florida, has found the radio transmissions to be a noxious and offensive activity, the appearance of the tower and antenna an annoyance and nuisance to the neighborhood, and quoting the Final Judgment, "This large, tall (87-feet) tower and antenna sticks out like an eyesore to this subdivision and neighborhood." Smith also broadly ruled that the tower is a building that exceeds the two story limitation for buildings in the deed restrictions and limitations of the subdivision. The deed restrictions are silent about antenna support structures.

Pending appeal, Smith has stayed his order to remove the radio tower and antenna but has enjoined the Browsers from further radio transmissions from their home! If the Browsers are not successful with the appeal, this case will set a dangerous precedent for any Ham who has a neighbor that does not like the appearance of his exterior antenna and alleges interference to home electronic appliances. Like the Browsers, the Ham will be ordered by the court to remove his tower and cease radio transmissions.

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #37  
\*\*\*\*\*